



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,166	12/07/1999	JOSE VILLENA	CELLIT-003XX	6064
28452	7590	06/02/2005	EXAMINER	
BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A. 835 HANOVER STREET SUITE 303 MANCHESTER, NH 03104			BLOUNT, STEVEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2661	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/456,166

Applicant(s)

VILLENA ET AL.

Examiner

Steven Blount

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16 - 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16 - 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 16 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 16, beginning in line 3, applicant has claimed a contact center which comprises a local area network in combination with a first and at least a second switching apparatus, said first and second switching apparatus corresponding to a plurality of CCPRO switches as described in the specification beginning on page 4 lines 21+ and referenced many times throughout (it is apparently referred to as a “chasis” in the summary of the invention). The examiner notes that applicant has described it in the specification as being a TDM switch (page 6, lines 2+). The examiner believes that to implement it (the CCPRO switch) in the manner as claimed with respect to its ability to interface with trunk lines, agent stations, processing resources, and to connect to a public network as well as another CCPRO switch (Cl 16, line 7), one of ordinary skill in the art would require more of a description of the device and its construction than what is described of it in the specification.

3. Claims 16 – 27 are allowable over the prior art of record, though the enablement rejections remain. The closest prior art, US patent 5,915,012 to Miloslavsky does not teach or fairly the number of broadbands being greater than or equal to the number of trunks plus the number stations. Miloslavsky teaches tie lines 188 which, in view of the teachings of col 8 lines 13+, cannot be considered to be broadband connections formed in this manner.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner maintains that to implement applicants invention in the manner as claimed with respect to trunk lines, agent stations, and processing resources, and to connect to a public network, one of ordinary skill in the art would require more than what is described in the specification.

Applicant states that the CCPRO is conventional in the art. If this is so, then since the CCPRO forms the heart of the invention with its ability to interface with the members as described above, the examiner does not understand what it is that is new or non-obvious in the applicants claimed invention.

In the previous Office action, the examiner requested that the applicant specifically state which portion of the claimed invention is new, and which (if any) has been publicly known or used prior to the filing date of this application. The examiner believed that this request was reasonable in view of the fact that the applicant has used the word CCPRO throughout the specification, and two printed publications reference

the CCPRO directly. Also, the CCPRO appears to form the majority of what is being claimed in claim 1, based upon the teachings of the specification. The examiner also noted the following document which was submitted by the applicant: "3COM: CellIT launches breakthrough multimedia call center solution based on high-speed 3Com systems (M2 Presswire; Coventry; March 4, 1998). This article also references the CCPRO directly, in what the examiner believes is rather specific detail in the second page.

Because the applicant did not respond to this request for information, the examiner submits that applicants response is incomplete and substantively non-responsive.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2661

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Blount whose telephone number is 571 - 272 - 3071. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Chau Nguyen, can be reached on 571 - 272 - 3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**Ajit Patel**  
**Primary Examiner**

SB  
  
5/26/2005